

[16th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I want to know how many Members are for the motion being taken up."

(Many hon. Members stood up in their places.)

I allow the motion. I shall fix a date in consultation with the Leader of the House and the Leaders of Parties.

"We shall now take up the next item on the Agenda."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Sir, what about the other adjournment motion of which I have given notice?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The ruling already given by me holds good for that motion also."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"It is a different matter, Sir, about the arrest of about 94 persons in some other place."

SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR:—"I have given notice of another adjournment motion, Sir. It is about the arrest of Sri Veeraswamy."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will look into all of them. We will now take up the next item. Mr. Thimma Reddi will now speak."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"On a point of order, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member come to my Chamber, I will hear him." (Laughter.)

### III.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

#### THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—cont.

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, ever since the declaration came from Delhi that the Andhras will have their State, I felt it will be better for me to talk less. That is the reason why though there was need for me to speak, though I found there was much on which I could have spoken, I refrained from speaking during the Budget debate. And now when the Bill is before us I thought there were our friends who could offer their valuable suggestions on the Bill and I felt I could stop with offering my thanks and appreciation to the Government here and at Delhi. But now I am forced to speak on this Bill for three reasons. The first is an incidental remark made by the Hon. the Chief Minister yesterday that the report of Mr. Misra is an award. The second is the fast undertaken by Sri Tetali Kami Reddi in Bellary, a man of great reputation and a big Gandhite and who is on the last days of his life. He will be as great a man to the people of Bellary as Sri Potti Sriramulu is to Andhra. The third is the remarks made by my hon. Friend Sri Vinayakam."

"Sir, I take this occasion to say a few words about the Bill before the House. Rajaji is a very great administrator. He is one of the few great leaders of this country. We all feel that he alone could steer the Government. He has done many things to

16th July 1953] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

the satisfaction of all people during the past one and a half years. It was he that was able to form a stable Government in this State at a critical time. But then in the course of events this division of the State has come. We have all been feeling that he will be able to steer clear of all difficulties and troubles and that he will give the Andhras a good send-off. While opening the debate on the Bill, Rajaji said it will be a great occasion for the Andhras, as pleasurable as the day when this country got independence, when this country got rid of the slavery from the British Rule. I ask, is it really an occasion for pleasure? I submit to the House and to the Leader of the House that the Andhras are given a send-off with more pain than pleasure. There should have been no need for a debate on this Bill if it had been properly framed. This Bill contains clause after clause which creates suspicions. When common properties are divided between brothers why should there be any secrecy about it between the brothers? Why not all the Members of the House and the public know what are all the assets and liabilities, how are the properties to be divided and who are all the officers that are going to be apportioned to the different States? These things ought not to be kept secret. They should all be open affairs. As it is, everyone is under a suspicion and more so the Andhra public. Every hon. Member from Tamil Nad asks me whether the clauses and proposals in the Bill are to my satisfaction. I in turn ask them whether they are to their satisfaction. They express surprise at these provisions. I submit this is a Bill which should be seriously considered and fully examined and all should give their considered suggestions to Parliament to enable Parliament to take proper decisions and pass the Bill into an Act.

“ Sir, Rajaji has been a great leader. I have been saying this very often. He incarnates the entire Government and the Cabinet in himself. I say this particularly for one reason. When there was a suggestion from the Andhra leaders that some non-officials should also be taken into the Committee formed to examine the partition problems, the suggestion was rejected. All kinds of suspicions arose then in the hearts of the people that it was going to be Rajaji's affair and so the decision also was going to be Rajaji's. It was said ‘Ministers might be there on the Committee, officials might be there on the Committee. They are only there as Members of the Committee but the final verdict will be that of Rajaji.’ That was the feeling of the people here and in Andhra also. Sir, Rajaji had been a great lawyer. Many seniors had been mentioning about his achievements as a lawyer. We all know him as a lawyer. But my conception of a big lawyer is this: To argue a case based on truth, where there is proper evidence, is there need for a big lawyer? Any ordinary lawyer will do to establish and win such a case. But a great lawyer is necessary only in bad cases. Lawyers have become great because they have won bad cases, because they have converted untruth into truth, and converted bad into good. That is how I feel great lawyers have come into existence. That is why I feel when properties and lives are involved, big lawyers are brought from other States. A big lawyer from Bombay was brought here to defend in a murder case. He



[Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

[16th July 1953]

tried to make out a case for the defence but failed. So also our big lawyers are taken to Bombay, Delhi and elsewhere, to defend bad cases. Should I take it that Rajaji is one such big lawyer?

“ Sir, I take it that lawyers are people who try to get maximum justice. If Rajaji is really a great lawyer, then our interests, the interests of the Andhras should be safeguarded by Rajaji himself. I may tell the House, we are now concerned with the question of division of assets and liabilities. And Rajaji in himself constitutes the entire tribunal and the entire Committee, and everything. That being so, why should there be doubts, why should there be amendments moved by different parties? There are amendments moved even by our Tamil friends. I take it that Rajaji has carried through the whole affair as a big lawyer. Sir, we had been feeling that we were not treated properly, that the men in the services were not given full opportunities, that our areas requiring industrial development were not given good attention and so on. Yesterday the hon. Member Sri Adityan was saying that all the Chief Ministers of this State were Andhras up till now. He included Rajaji also as an Andhra. (Interruption.) If hon. Members Sri Vinayakam and Sri Adityan should differ in their views, they can settle accounts elsewhere. But he had been telling me all the Chief Ministers were Andhras. (Interruption.) If Rajaji is not now an Andhra, he is bound to become an Andhra in course of time.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Sir, on a point of order. I want the hon. Member to know that my name is Vinayakam and not Adityan.”

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—“ Sir, I did not refer to Sri Vinayakam as Sri Adityan. But I was saying that Sri Adityan was telling me that Rajaji also was an Andhra. If Sri Vinayakam is not able to understand what I was saying, I am not responsible for that. Other hon. Members have understood what I have been saying and they have not raised any objection. If Rajaji's own taluk, his birth place Hosur chooses to come to Andhra, he will not belong to Tamilnad, he will lose his citizenship of Tamilnad, but he will be an Andhra and he will be forced to become an Andhra.

“ Sir, when the question was started, I thought Rajaji would be very fair and just. I think he is just and fair to the Tamils. But the provisions of this Bill and the experience of the Andhras show that they will not get the right verdict. For Andhras and Tamils to be good friends and good neighbours, this question of distribution and division of properties and other things should be dealt with fairly. Sir, I request Rajaji—it is not too late and the Andhra State is only in the process of making—to accept the amendments and make it a non-disputable debate so far as this House is concerned and let us recommend to the Parliament in Delhi to take the final decision on that basis.

“ Sir, there are three things in this Bill on which, I feel, I should speak a little. They are about the boundaries, the officers and financial aspects. Sir, yesterday Rajaji while referring to

16th July 1953]

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

Mr. Latchanna's adjournment motion said that the report of Justice Misra was an award. I take serious objection to it. Every Andhra takes serious objection to it and to the remark that he made that the agitation in Bellary is engineered and is run by the Krishak Lok Party. I submit that it is not the Krishak Lok Party, but it is the Congress, it is the Communists, it is the independent Communists and other Andhras who are interested there. So much so, I say that the agitation in Bellary has nothing to do with any one party; it is the agitation of the people there. It is the agitation of the people affected and insulted. People from places beyond Bellary borders, long way from Bhadrachalam, Vijayavada, etc., are going to Bellary to participate in the agitation. As such I am sorry to have heard those remarks of Rajaji yesterday that the agitation is ours. It is not so. It is an agitation of the people.

“ Sir when the life of Sri Kami Reddi is in danger it is said that it is no concern of this Government. It is the concern of the Government as much as it is in the case of yesterday's firing. It is going to lead to an incident like that. The life of Sri Potti Sriramulu was sacrificed and Sri Kami Reddi's holy efforts in Bellary may also end like that. I submit that the areas should be given to the particular State where the people prefer to remain, whether it is Andhra or Mysore.

“ Sir, I ask the hon. Members to read the report of Justice Misra. Is it the report of a lawyer for a particular party or is it the report of a judge on an impartial reading of the situation there? Were the facts presented to him as a lawyer and as a party, Sir? Sri Jawaharlal Nehru of the Central Government has passed his final verdict. We cannot expect Sri Nehru to have gone through the entire report. It is difficult and impossible. For that matter any Minister, more so the Chief Minister, cannot look into all the papers that are placed on his table. So also Mr. Nehru has passed his final verdict. When justice is not properly done, is it wrong to represent? We are not arguing; we are not threatening; ours is not an agitation like any other agitation with serious consequences. We are only honestly and humbly submitting to Government here that the question must be re-examined for the creation of an Andhra Province with undisputed areas.

“ Mr. Vinayakam has gained his point. When there was a longstanding report about the Andhra Province, when there were arguments and counter-arguments about the boundaries of this Andhra Province, the J.V.P. Report—wherein the name of Nehru himself is mentioned—closed the question. When that was so, the question has been brought forward for re-opening the subject with the agitation of Mr. Vinayakam. I am glad of this agitation in Tiruttani taluk. We have no objection to ceding of the Tamil villages or the six taluks or the entire district. We can be happy by ourselves. But let us represent to Sri Nehru or the Government to consider these things. Whatever motives were behind the agitation of Tiruttani, with whatever motives and whatever other



[Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

[16th July 1953]

interests, sane and insane, the agitation was carried on, Sri Vinayakam has got what he wanted for the Tamils and an enquiry has been promised on a question which was closed and on which final decision had been taken by many committees and many people including Sri Nehru himself. Cannot this question of Bellary also be re-opened? It must be re-opened with the support of all Members of this House. I am only pleading for a plebiscite and Misra report itself concedes that nothing short of a plebiscite will decide this question. Under these circumstances I submit that the question of Bellary must be re-opened for decision by a plebiscite. I wish the entire support of the House is there for that.

“ Sir, it was stated in Mr. Wanchoo's report that the Andhras could remain in Madras for some time. Then it was Rajaji that ran up to Delhi and managed to see that the Andhras did not remain any longer in Madras after the final date and he gave certain remarks or readings of his own that otherwise there will be very serious consequences in Madras. All that is past history.

“ Sir, I must say that in Bellary we went by default. There was nobody to speak on behalf of the Andhras. There were Karnatakas—Dr. Nagan Gouda is smiling. So, Sir, it is not a question of population or things like that for which Bellary and the firkas were conceded to Mysore. I hope Mr. Vinayakam will uphold the case of Bellary as much as his Tiruttani. Though we have two representatives in the Centre, one is an international trade unionist, so he cannot take any sides and the other is a philosopher and he also will not take sides. So much so, we lost Bellary. But this question has become a big problem for us. I request the Hon. the Chief Minister and the House to recommend to the Government at Delhi to re-examine this question. More than anything, the people of these areas should be given a full chance of a plebiscite to decide which way they wish to go. We wish all to live in peace and as good neighbours. Anybody anywhere should feel that he is the native of that area, that he is the citizen of that area and that he was born in that place. We cannot afford to raise the passions of the people. We cannot incite or compel people to do anything. That is somewhat criminal. I say I am not for those things. In Bellary a peaceful satyagraha was going on and lathi charge was ordered; innocent children were injured. If that Reserve Police could understand the language of the area, if they could understand Telugu, they would not have done it. Some Tamil and Malabar friends in the police were there. Somebody said, ‘ March, punish the people ’ and they immediately lathi-charged them and those people including innocent children were in the hospital for weeks and weeks as in-patients. They did not . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member has already taken 20 minutes.”

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—“ Please excuse me, Sir. Two more sentences and I will finish.

“ Sir, in regard to the assets and liabilities I would like to say a few words. I want all my friends to pay their full attention to

16th July 1953] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

the two expressions 'book values' and 'depreciation' mentioned in the Bill. They are mischievous, deceiving and exploiting expressions and they cut at the roots of Andhra interests. Therefore the problem of assets and liabilities must be thoroughly examined. One word in regard to the crime branch of the Madras Government and I have done. Even at dead of night lorry loads of electrical goods had been carried away from Pakala sub-station to Madras and the next morning an order came that no goods should be transferred from one area to the other after the appointed day. What action has been taken by the Government against the officers responsible for this act? Sir, the officers are greatly annoyed. Fifty per cent of the agitation for the formation of a separate Andhra State is mainly due to the behaviour of the officers . . ."

\* SRI K. KOTI REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, I am happy on this occasion to support the motion moved by the Hon. Chief Minister recommending the introduction of the Andhra State Bill in Parliament. Andhra Members of this House will be failing in their duty if on the eve of the formation of the Andhra State they do not offer their grateful thanks to the Andhra leaders who are no more; the foremost among them being Konda Venkatappayya Pantulu of Guntur, Nageswara Rao Pantulu, Mutnuri Krishna Rao and lastly Potti Sriramulu and who, along with many other leaders now living, worked hard for the formation of the Andhra State. It is not necessary for me now to go into the past history of the Andhra movement which has been going on for more than four decades now. All this time we have been agitating and anxiously waiting for the formation of a State of our own and whether we are satisfied fully or not with the State to be formed, we cannot but express our joy at this moment.

" So far as the Bill is concerned, it does not satisfy us to the extent to which we would like it to have. When the clauses are taken up for discussion, we will have enough time to point out to the Assembly in what respects this Bill is really defective from our point of view. One is the division of assets and liabilities and unless drastic changes are made in the clauses pertaining to assets and liabilities, great injustice will be done to the interests of Andhras.

" Then I would like to say a few words in regard to the boundary commission and the areas which have to be included in the Andhra State. We have been for a very long time anxious to form a State which is now known as Visala Andhra to be included in it not only the areas in the present State of Madras, but also the areas in Mysore, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. I believe, Sir, a time will come and it will come sooner than later when we will have Visala Andhra. But at present we shall be satisfied with what is given to us. Even then some injustice has been done in respect of a portion of Bellary taluk. The contention of the people of this particular area is that the census figures on which the Misra Award is mainly based, are not correct. The hon. Member Mr. Vinayakam also expressed the same opinion in regard to the census figures of Tiruttani taluk of Chittoor district, if what is



[Sri K. Koti Reddi]

[16th July 1953]

reported in the newspapers is correct. I do not want to go into details now, but the time may come when the census figures can be proved to be not correct. Sir, even Mr. Misra said that his was a report and not an award. It was a report which was submitted to the Government of India and on that a decision had been taken by the Government of India. When a decision has been arrived at on a vital matter like this affecting lakhs of people and when it is felt that a wrong has been done, it is up to us to agitate and get the wrong rectified. After all, what is it that the people of three firkas of Bellary taluk are asking for? They are only saying that Mr. Misra's report is not based on correct census figures and that Mr. Misra has not given the people of those firkas any opportunity to prove that the census figures are not correct. They are not asking that the Government of India must revise their decision in any case and they are not fighting against their decision either. They only want that an opportunity should be given to them to decide the issue by a democratic method. In these days of parliamentary democracy, why should not a chance be given to the people to decide their own fate? It is not a small matter. It is a matter affecting the vital interests of a fairly large number of people. It will be in the interests of Government and of the people in the contiguous areas if this democratic method is adopted for all the disputed areas and a chance given to the people to decide the question for themselves. If we are asking for an Andhra State, it does not necessarily mean that all the Andhras in the border or adjoining areas should come over to the new State. It may not be possible and it is also not possible. Some Andhras may prefer to be in the residuary State and why should they not be given a chance? If to-day some Kanarese people also in the three firkas of Bellary taluk want to be with Andhras, why should they not be given a chance?

11-30  
a.m.

“What is the criterion that should weigh with the Government in determining the wishes of the people? Surely the answer is only by way of a plebiscite, can they accurately judge public opinion. What did Mr. Misra himself say in his report? Has he not made a reference once or twice in his report, even though that pertains only to a particular area, that public opinion could be properly assessed only by means of a plebiscite. That is why I say the Government of India had erred and Justice Misra had erred in adjudging Bellary taluk to be for a purely Kanarese State. How can we say so before taking a plebiscite? In this connexion I wish to bring to the notice of the House the fast which had entered the 20th day to-day, of Sri Kami Reddi? What for is he fasting? It is because he clings to a certain principle and that principle after all is not anything strange. He says that the proper course that the Union Government has to adopt before deciding the future of Bellary is to hold a plebiscite. That has not been done. A judge had given his findings and the same had been accepted. When such is the case, is it wrong that some satyagrahis are fasting? What did that great satyagrahi, Sri Potti Sriramulu, do? For what did he die? What is it that Mahatma Gandhiji taught us?

16th July 1953]

[Sri K. Koti Reddi]

Of course, on an occasion, we say that we want to follow the non-violent method, the principal teaching of Mahatmaji. What did he say? Did he not say that we ought to achieve anything that we wanted only through non-violence? When such is the case, what is wrong if two satyagrahis are fasting in Bellary, when they are convinced that their course of action is a non-violent one? That is why I say it would be by far better if the Union Government were to hold a plebiscite in the near future to decide the future of some firkas of Bellary taluk. Incidentally I may also say that if they were to do so they would be correcting an error which many believe they had committed in having accepted the Misra award adjudging Bellary taluk to be out and out Kanarese.

“ May I now just touch upon one aspect concerning the Tungabhadra Project? Ever since I entered the Council about thirty years ago, there have been two questions that I have been trying to bring to the attention of the Government. One of them related to the starting of the Tungabhadra Project. The other concerned the villages. I was one of those who always felt that the villages in the Madras State were being neglected and that the towns were developed at the expense of the villages. For the economic development of the Rayalaseema area the starting of the Tungabhadra Project was considered to be the only remedy. As long ago as 1901 an Irrigation Commission was appointed to consider the feasibility of utilizing the waters of the Tungabhadra for eradicating the famine in Rayalaseema. After full investigation the Government unfortunately came to the conclusion that the Tungabhadra Project would not be remunerative. The whole scheme was therefore deferred. The cry of the people of Rayalaseema was not taken due notice of by the then British Government. Ever since the scheme was deferred and up to the period when the Advisers' regime began to function, nothing was done in that direction. Thanks to the initiative of one of the Advisers, I mean Sir S. V. Ramamurthi, the Tungabhadra Project was taken up for execution. To-day, Sir, we find the Tungabhadra Project nearing completion. Whereas the earlier project was intended to benefit 16 to 17 lakh acres in the Ceded districts the present Tungabhadra Project is to irrigate only about three lakh acres in Kurnool and Bellary districts. The High Level canal has not yet been taken up. Only the completion of that canal would mean the bringing in of water-supply to Pulivendla taluk in Cuddapah district and Gooty and Tadpatri taluks in Anantapur district. Unless this High Level Canal Scheme is executed, there is no other permanent source of irrigation for these places. Of course the waters of the Pennar could be utilized. But it should not be forgotten that the Pennar has no adequate water-supply. Therefore, the only course left is to immediately complete the High Level Canal Scheme. I am sorry to find that for the present, there is provision only for the Low Level Canal Scheme which will irrigate about 3 lakh acres in Kurnool and Bellary. I would earnestly request the future Andhra Government to immediately sanction the execution of the High Level Canal Scheme and see to it that the Tungabhadra Project as it was first



[Sri K. Koti Reddi]

[16th July 1953]

adumbrated by Colonel Macknezi is executed for with. Such a course alone would mean a permanent protection, though partly for the people of Rayalaseema, from the evil of famine.

“ Sir, it has become usual especially whenever the question of Linguistic States is discussed in this House to make an appeal to friends on both sides to remain calm and eschew bitter feelings and also at the same time give mutual assurances of goodwill and fair-play to all people concerned. So also I want to take this opportunity to give a similar assurance on behalf of myself to my friends who may not ultimately form part of the Andhra State. It may be that for some time, we have got to agitate for inclusion in the Andhra State, as our goal of Visala Andhra is to be realized, many Andhra areas in Mysore, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. Maybe at that time, some bitter feelings may be roused and unlawful action taken by miscreants. But I am sure that once Visala Andhra is realized, goodwill and tolerance will prevail among the neighbouring States and all things will come to a happy conclusion. Mr. Speaker, I have really been at a loss to understand the apprehension in the minds of some of my Tamil friends that were we to get the Andhra State their interests might be jeopardised. They want assurances. What are they for, I ask? After all we know these States had been carved out to suit the conveniences of the Britishers, who were ruling us in the past. The carving out of these States has been more or less a historical accident. After independence, what is it that we require? Is there anything wrong in people wishing to form themselves into a homogeneous unit by means of language, I mean, on linguistic basis? What does our Constitution say? Has it not only laid down that there ought to be one national language for the whole of India but given due consideration for mother tongue? When such is the case, is there anything wrong in our claiming to form ourselves into linguistic units, each with its own respective language? What does our Constitution say in this direction? Has it not laid down that within the States the language of the administration, in the universities and even in the legislatures in the States can be the regional language? Well, then, I ask what is wrong in forming linguistic States? Is it not better to teach our children in our own mother tongue and build up their character and make them useful citizens of the country?

11-40  
a.m.

“ At the same time let us not forget that wherever we may be we are first and foremost citizens of the bigger unit, namely, the Indian Union. Do we not know that our own Constitution lays down enough safeguards for us to live amicably? Is there not a provision in our Constitution by which the Centre has the ultimate control over all the States in the Indian Union? When such is the case, what is there for the Tamilians who live in Andhra area or for the Andhras who live in the Tamil area to fear? As a matter of fact, some lakhs and lakhs of Andhras are now living in Tamil areas. I know many of them have got big interests there. When they are anxious to live in that area alone and are happy

16th July 1953]

[Sri K. Koti Reddi]

over there, why should they be displaced? For instance, I can cite several examples where Tamilians have settled in Andhra area and are living happily. In Cuddapah several Tamilians have settled down and they are living amicably with the Andhras there. Can't a Tamilian live happily in an Andhra area or a Telugu in a Tamil area? If, for instance, a Tamilian were to offer a rice bag to an Andhra at a low cost, will any Andhra refuse to buy the same because he is a Tamilian? No, he will not. So long as the transaction is in his favour, anyone would be prepared to accept the offer. For instance, how can I refuse the iddli and sambar of the Tamilians, in the preparation of which they are experts?

“ Let me now come to the point. Where the people in a particular area express unanimously or almost unanimously a particular view, that view should be taken due notice of. For instance, take the case of Bellary. The Telugu-speaking people in Bellary have with one voice demanded that Bellary be included in the proposed Andhra State. So also Kannadigas are for Mysore. What did the Government of India do? How did they assess public opinion there? Did they hold any referendum or plebiscite? Compare this with what the Prime Minister had done with reference to Kashmir? What did he say? How is he going to assess the opinion of the people of Kashmir? The Prime Minister had declared very rightly that after Kashmir became quiet and free from Pakistan trouble, they would hold a plebiscite. If that is the declared policy of the Central Government, why should they shrink from doing so in Bellary? Why should they appoint a Judge to decide the issue? Can any man decide such an issue satisfactorily? That is why I say the Central Government had erred so far as Bellary was concerned. Therefore I plead with the Central Government to hold a plebiscite in Bellary to decide its future ultimately. The fundamental criterion of ascertaining the opinion of the people residing in a particular area before deciding the future of that area should not be lost sight of. That is why I say wherever boundary commissions are appointed to settle the claims of disputed areas, let clear-cut instructions be issued to them to assess public opinion by means of a plebiscite. For instance, take the case of Kolar in Mysore. The majority of people living in Kolar are Telugus. They have been living amicably there all these years. As I had observed previously these States were carved out in the process of history by the ruling Britishers for their own convenience. Of course, they said it was for their administrative convenience. Suppose you appoint a Boundary Commission to decide the future of Kolar. Simply because the majority of its inhabitants are Telugus, the Boundary Commission cannot at once decide that Kolar be included in the Andhra State. Let them hold a plebiscite and ascertain the opinion of the people in Kolar. Suppose due to their long association with Bangalore, the capital of Mysore, they express the view that they prefer remaining in Mysore itself; we can never go counter to that opinion. That is why I still repeat that the voice of the people should be first ascertained in all disputed border areas.



[Sri K. Koti Reddi]

[16th July 1953]

[At this stage, the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.]

11-50  
a.m.

" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I make an appeal to my non-Andhra friends, the Tamils, Kannadigas and Malayalees that the choice should be left to the people concerned. So far as I am concerned, I have not lost hope that the people would like to have some association with us; though the people of Tiruttani may feel that Kurnool is far off yet the chances are there and there is a possibility of some of them, if not most of them, trying to be along with their friends near and around them and that is why I suggest that the question should be left to the people and they should do things with a full knowledge of the consequences of their choice. Propaganda there may be and just as in the conduct of elections money may be spent; there may be many difficulties. If the matter is decided by a Commission, heart-burning is likely to result but when once the people make their choice, there is no question of bitterness and nobody can be found fault with, neither the Government of this State nor of the union, for it is the choice of the people. So far as I am concerned, I would say that in all boundary questions, the final voice should be the verdict of the people and it should be settled by means of a plebiscite. Let us understand that we are living in days of democracy. In the matter of deciding the question on this footing, there is no likelihood of illfeeling between us or any possibility of an unfair deal. I had no difficulty to get on with the people of the South. There are fifty lakhs of Telugu-speaking people living comfortably and happily in the South and will any one expect the Andhras to be hard upon any Tamilians that may be residing in the Andhra State? That will not be but on the other hand, I am expecting a large percentage of labouring and other classes of people to come into the Andhra Desa for purposes of employment. I can assure you, Sir, that the Andhras at any rate are not going to be less generous than others; they could not be less generous than others; on the other hand, our feeling is that we are likely to be over-generous and naturally we suffer for it sometimes.

" Yesterday dealing with the three firkas of Bellary, one of the Members coming from the Kannada area of Bellary district said something which I did not then understand because he spoke in Kannada. Later on I found that he attributed a statement to me to the effect that at a public meeting at Bellary, I said that it would be a ' Kurukshetra ' if some things were not done. I assure all Members here including that hon. Member that I never made such a statement. I never addressed a public meeting. A meeting in the drawing room of a private house was held over which I presided; invitations had been issued to the Members of the Legislature and a few leaders of Andhra Desa. I could never have said such a thing as attributed to me. Presumably there has been an error in the report of my speech. I appealed to the Government to revise their orders and particularly to the friends who had gathered there, I appealed that there should be no sort of violent action. My hon. Friend said that he found it mentioned in the papers. Sometimes it happens that prejudice influences the reporters and untrue report

16th July 1953] [Sri K. Koti Reddi]

results. Unfortunately, I did not read these papers especially as they were Kannada papers. I would appeal to him not to put down this statement to me and I want him, the Government and every hon. Member in the House not to think that I made the statement. You know, Sir, that a harmless person like me could never have given expression to such a thing as the hon. Member mentioned? With this assurance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the Bill."

\* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir. I rise to support the motion before the House and while doing so, I want to express the sense of rejoicing not only of the Andhra people, not only of the Andhra Members of this House but of the entire democratic movement of this country over the happy victory that the Andhra people have secured. I am sorry to say that the debate over this motion has not been properly initiated by the Hon. the Chief Minister; in fact, when he was making the speech, I was struck with the dry nature of the speech and I felt he was making a sort of ritualistic speech and performing a sort of ritual that was imposed upon him: 'An Andhra State has got to be created; we cannot help it, however much I might have desired that no such linguistic State should be created and however much I might have wished that the formation of linguistic States should be relegated to the background and it should be given up once and for all; none the less I am compelled under the circumstances, under the impact of the people's movement, to initiate the motion.' That is how I felt the feeling was there. The background of that feeling was there and I found that the Chief Minister was not able to rejoice with the people of the Andhra area and that is why he said that the day the Andhra State came into existence would be the day of rejoicing for the people of the Andhra area and they will rejoice over it on a scale far vaster than on August 15th, 1947. It has got a great significance. Why was it, Sir, that the people of our country who had contributed tremendously in the struggle for freedom from foreign imperialism, should be feeling after all that their achieving the Andhra State is of far greater significance and of far greater importance and is a matter for far greater rejoicing than even the freedom from foreign imperialism. I would like the Hon. the Chief Minister to understand the significance of the statement that he made. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari: 'Not less or perhaps the same,' was what I stated.) 'More than even on the 15th of August,' that is how it is reported. Even then, Sir, it is not less but it is on the same level. The rejoicing of the people of the Andhra area is to the same extent as on the fifteenth of August. Why should it be so, Sir? It is exactly there that I would like to ask the Hon. the Chief Minister who is holding an important position not only in this State but in the public affairs of this country, to revise his opinion and understand the significance of the growth of the people's movement. Had he understood it, the Hon. the Chief Minister would have told us while initiating the debate, what were the fundamental principles upon which the entire Bill was based. After all, there have been



[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[16th July 1953]

previous reports on this question ; there was the J.V.P. Report, there was the Wanchoo Report and there was the Report of the Partition Committee and all these things were there and the Bill has been framed on the basis of certain principles.

12 noon. " This question has been dealt with in these various reports and the Hon. the Chief Minister has had also the opportunity—a tremendous amount of opportunity—to shape the Bill. The Government of Madras were consulted while framing the Bill. Therefore, if the Hon. the Chief Minister had only taken us into his confidence and told us the basic principles on which the various provisions in the Bill were framed, this discussion would have taken a different turn and it would have been much more helpful. It has therefore been left to us to guess and find out what those principles are and on that basis lay down certain fundamental principles as the criteria.

" I now come to the broader principles that are involved in this Bill. The fundamental principle that is involved is the principle of democracy. The Hon. the Chief Minister might to-day have revised his opinion. There was a time in 1942 when he issued a statement in the Press of India wherein he had referred to the way in which the leaders of the Soviet Union had solved the problems of a multi-national and multi-lingual State and upheld the example of the Soviet Union as one of the best ways, in fact, the only way of solving the problems of multi-national and multi-lingual States. This was in 1942. To-day the Chief Minister might have revised his opinions as he has done on so many other matters concerning the national movement. This question has been discussed from time immemorial not only by the Hon. the Chief Minister but by the entire national movement. As early as 1920, the national movement put before the people of this country a picture of the India that was to be. It was only on the basis of this picture that the people could be inspired to fight for freedom. We cannot inspire a people to fight against a foreign imperialism without placing before them a concrete picture of the kind of society that is to be evolved after freedom is achieved and a vision or a picture of the administrative apparatus that is going to be set up. Because the national movement understood this basic principle of mobilising the people of a country, they placed before the people a picture of the India of the future. What did they say then? The leaders of the national movement including Sri C. Rajagopalachari did not talk of the division or partition of the country. They had a different conception of these linguistic States. The exact words they used were the 'redistribution of States.' Now, let us not get away with the words that we are parting. There is no question of division or partition that is involved in this case. It is a case of redistribution of States and, as I said in the last session of this Assembly, the Indian National Congress took up the challenge of the British Government which appointed an all-white Simon Commission and it convened an All Party Conference under the presidentship of the father of the Prime Minister of India, the late Pandit Motilal Nehru. In that Conference there

[16th July 1953]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

were members from various political parties. The late Sir Taj Bahadur Sapru, Mahomed Ali Jinnah, Subhas Chandra Bose and Sri M. S. Aney were all members of this Conference. This Conference appointed a special sub-committee to go into the question of drafting a Constitution for the future of this country. What has this Committee stated in Chapter IV of its report? They have pointed out that the existing distribution of States had no rational basis whatsoever. How did this distribution come about? They have pointed out that it was merely due to accident and the circumstances which attended the growth of British power in India during the early days of its expansion. There was no other rational basis whatever for the existence of the various States as they existed in 1947 and continue to exist even to-day.

“ The Committee therefore pointed out that this irrational basis must be smashed and a new rational basis must be evolved on certain fundamental principles on which the States ought to be redistributed. They had also pointed out what those principles should be. The main consideration must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned. They had then pointed out the well recognised principles that rapid progress in education as well as in general culture and in most developments of life depended on language and that if a foreign language was the medium of instruction and also for conducting the affairs of the State, the growth of that country must necessarily be stunted. No democracy can exist where a foreign language is used for conducting the affairs of the State. In a democracy the people must be well informed and must be able to understand and follow public affairs in order to take an effective part in them. The question of linguistic States was therefore looked upon by the leaders of the national movement, in fact, by the entire national movement as a question fundamental to democracy for the people of this country. There will be no democracy if linguistic States are not there and the people are not allowed to receive instruction in their own language and are not allowed to participate in the affairs of the State. Without democracy there can be no real growth in the life of the people, there can be no real growth in the culture and language of the people and there can be no real economic upsurge leading to economic reconstruction. It was on the basis of these fundamental principles that the leaders of the national movement put before the people this picture of the India of the future. As far as I can understand, the national movement was certainly not a disruptive movement. It did not stand for the disunity of the country; it did not stand for the division or partition of this country but stood for the unity of the country. The national movement's concept of unity was not merely an idealistic concept. It had a material basis also for people are united together only when their material interests are also united. People do not go together merely because of some spiritual things. The history of the world has proved it. (Interruption from the Treasury Bench : ‘ Karl Marx has proved it ’.) For example, if Rajaji who talks in season and out of season (the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari :



[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[16th July 1953]

'Never out of season') is not able to convince the Andhra members of his own Congress Party, who have been with him for the last 30 years, of the value of spiritualism and therefore they should remain together, it is obvious that his talk of unity on the basis of spiritualism has not stood the test of time. It is material interests that unite people. It is because of the fact that the leaders of the national movement understood this fundamental principle that they said: 'Even while we stand for unity on the basis of democracy, let us give an opportunity for the people to grow and to manage their own affairs.' A unity that is cemented on the basis of a voluntary and willing accession of the various parts will be far more strong and will be steel-like in strength. This was the kind of unity that national leaders cherished at that time. That was so in 1928, 1929 and 1940 but in 1947, after August 15th, the entire situation has changed. This same picture cannot now be placed before the people. The question of viability of the various States must be taken into consideration and administrative convenience has also got to be considered. All these new excuses have now been trotted out in order to deny the rights of the people to have a Government administering the affairs in their own language. Is it to be supposed that the national movement did not take note of these things at that time? No, Sir. The very same Committee took note of these things. What is the answer they gave? They took into consideration a third factor—though not of the same importance as administrative convenience—which would include geographical position, economic resources and the financial stability of the areas concerned. They further said that administrative convenience was often a matter of arrangement and must certainly bow down to the wishes of the people. On this subject the Nehru Committee also adopted a resolution on August 30, 1928 recommending the formation of Andhra, Aikya Kerala, Karnataka and Orissa Provinces immediately. That was the picture in 1928.

12-10  
p.m.

"In 1947, what was the picture? The fundamental concepts of the Congress organisation on ever so many questions had changed. In 1930, the Congress Party told the people that all the debts contracted by the British Government would be repudiated as soon as freedom was won because they were not contracted in the interests of India but were contracted for the purpose of keeping a foreign power in India. To-day no such repudiation has taken place. In fact we go out of the way to assure the British people that no such repudiation will take place. We go still further and say that they need not return something of the money that they had taken forcibly by way of accumulated sterling balances between 1940 and 1945. Similarly on the question of formation of linguistic States, the Congress leadership repudiates the fundamental principle which it had accepted in the course of the long national movement, and wants to go back. Everyone knows how many stumbling-blocks the Congress had put up even on the question of the formation of the Andhra State. The ruling party had been paying that they had no objection to the formation of the Andhra State and that in fact the J.V.P. Committee was appointed

16th July 1953]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

for the very purpose, and that even in the Constitution provision had been made for the formation of the Andhra State. We very well remember that the British Government had also no objection to the granting of freedom to this country. The British Government also said, 'Yes, you can have complete freedom provided there is complete unanimity and unity in the country.' Similarly taking a leaf out of the British Government, our Congress leadership also stated that provided there was complete unanimity—no voice should be raised by the parties concerned with regard to any dispute—there would be an Andhra State. In this way, for three or four long years, a separate State was denied to the Andhras. Unfortunately for the ruling party, the popular movement forced the Congress leadership to go forward with the formation of the Andhra State. It is because of the popular movement that a big breach has been made in the citadel of reaction. We congratulate the Andhra people not only on the victory that they have achieved for themselves but also on opening up one of the biggest breaches in the wall of reaction. As a matter of fact, the present Andhra State is not what the Andhras wanted. The Congress leadership has yet to accede to Visala Andhra resulting in the break-up of the feudal Hyderabad State. Still the victory achieved by the Andhras is a milestone in the march of the people towards freedom and democracy. We know, as a matter of fact, the announcement regarding the formation of the Andhra State had immediately set in motion vast forces not only in the Andhra areas but throughout the country—in Kerala for an Aikya Kerala State, in Maharashtra areas for a Maharashtra State, etc. The people have come to feel that the Nehru Government's obstruction can be broken and smashed to pieces. The Andhra people have shown us the way to break the Government to pieces and march forward. Such is the kind of confidence that the people of India have got. Even though the principle of linguistic States has not been fully accepted in this Bill, still the formation of the Andhra State contemplated here will be one of the biggest victories in the march of the people towards linguistic States. That is why, not only I rejoice, but the entire democratic movement and the country rejoice at the formation of the Andhra State on October 1st.

"I now come to other questions. Let us analyse the principles underlying the Bill. I am sorry to say that certain fundamental principles which should go to make a democracy have not been embodied in the Bill. With regard to questions like division of assets and liabilities, the demarcation of boundaries, etc., why did not the Government of India lay down certain fundamental criteria which should govern all these things? On the questions of division of assets and liabilities and demarcation of boundaries, I would like to make an appeal to all to understand the existing situation and not to complicate the situation by making one people fight against another. After all, the present state of affairs has come about not as a result of the fault of the people of either Tamilnad or Andhra or Malabar or any other area. We have all been the common victims of exploitation of the British power which



[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[16th July 1953]

had created this state of affairs. Therefore, the future generation or the existing generation can certainly not be held responsible for the misdeeds committed by the British Government. All of us had been exploited. The Andhra people had been exploited. The Tamilnad people had been exploited. Therefore, let us understand this. If this country had been free long ago and had there been no British domination and had we all been allowed to grow as free men, the entire situation in the country would have been different. We would then have made greater progress industrially and economically than most of the other countries in the world. But because of stunted growth, of suppressed growth, we find ourselves in this extremely bad situation. Therefore, what is the picture that is there before us in the country? Our State is a bankrupt State. When I say 'bankrupt State', I do not mean that our State has no resources. I mean that the net cash balance of the State is a minus one. When the Andhra State is to be formed, it is certainly up to the people of Tamilnad and the rest of the State to see to it that proper assistance is given to the Andhra State so that it may start on a proper foundation. The Andhra people should look at the question not as a question of division between them and the Tamil people. Let us understand that we are all equally in a bad position. At the same time, let us adopt some method—some rough and ready method—by which justice can be done. Whatever assets and liabilities there are, let us divide them equally, equitably and justly. On that basis, let us look at the question of demarcation of boundaries also. I do not know why we should generate so much heat on that question. After all we can adopt some simple principles—principles of justice and democracy—on the basis of which the whole question can be solved. After all, it is certainly open to us, when the new State comes into existence, to demand a Boundary Commission. It is also necessary for us to lay down certain criteria by which that Boundary Commission can decide issues entrusted to it. After all, contiguity of area, common language, that is, the same language as the language of the State to which that particular area belongs, should be decided village by village and not talukwar so that maximum justice can be done. On that basis, it is certainly open to us to come to an understanding so that we need not carry on any quarrel. I may have an idea that a particular area must immediately come to Tamilnad. Another person may have an idea that that area must belong to the Andhra State.

[At this stage, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

12-20  
p.m. " Let us look at the question on the basis of certain fundamental democratic principles and then we will find the whole problem is solved. I would therefore like the hon. Members to rejoice on this occasion when it is a tremendous victory for the democratic movement. Let us not mar that occasion. Let us not mar the happiness and rejoicings of the people by continuing the dispute or by using harsh words against each other. Let us all join in the rejoicings of the entire people. That is the appeal I would like to make to both sides of the House.

16th July 1953]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

“ Lastly, Sir, there is the responsibility of the Central Government. After all, even if the Andhra State is formed, we know that there are tremendous difficulties the new Andhra State will have to face. Economic regeneration, economic reconstruction or economic upsurge is certainly not going to be an easy affair. That is not going to be an easy affair even in Tamilnad. After all, both the Andhra State and the residuary Madras State are suffering under certain common disabilities, which are common not only to Andhra and Madras but to the entire country. We are suffering under certain constitutional provisions. We are suffering from the difficulties created by the Constitution under which the States have got absolutely very little power. The resources of the States are crippled and the bulk of the revenues of the State is being taken away by the Central Government which spends about 200 crores of rupees on a top-heavy military administration and on an equally top-heavy bureaucratic administration. Therefore, I say that the reconstruction of this country is going to be an extremely difficult affair. We look to the Andhra people also to help in the general democratic upsurge in the country and to fight to change this entire set-up so that the people of the various States will get sufficient resources in their hands in order to develop their States and to develop the country as a whole. That is the picture that is now standing before us. Therefore, I rejoice on this occasion. I have no qualms whatsoever, no feelings whatsoever, that the Andhra people are going to be separated from us, because in spite of this redistribution of States we were united together in the past. And what is it that united us in the past? It is not the fact that the Andhra people and the Tamil people were thrown up together in a common State. That is not the bond of unity. The bond of unity between them and the rest of the people of India was the fact that all of them were united together in the common struggle against the British Imperialism in this country. It was that bond that united us together—all the various democratic movements, the working classes of Andhra fighting for their demands alongside the working classes of Tamilnad, alongside the working classes of Bengal and in fact the whole of India. It was that which united the working classes and the democratic movement. Similarly, the Telengana peasants who were fighting for land have created a tremendous bond of unity among the peasantry of the whole of India. Let us not forget that. It is the common struggle of the people, the struggle for democracy, the struggle for land, the struggle for better existence and the common movements that are being thrown up by them. That is the real cementing force that has united the entire people. I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that even on this question of linguistic States it was the democratic movement in Andhra which was able to smash all other reactionary slogans and win this freedom. That democratic movement will play a very notable part—indeed the foremost part—in uniting the democratic movements of this country. Therefore, there is no question of any division. There is no question of any partition and there is no question of any distribution. When I say all these, I must also point out how it was



[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[16th July 1953]

that the Andhra movement was able to achieve this victory. There have been many disruptive slogans. Claims with regard to particular cities, claims with regard to particular areas—all these things—were there. In spite of all this, the Andhra movement was able to achieve a tremendous victory. Why was it? It was because, I make bold to say, the ideology of the working classes was there and that ideology played the foremost part in the movement for freedom. That ideology was able to smash all other ideologies and unite the people and bring them together, because the internationalism was far superior to so many slogans of 'sloganistic politicians'. The internationalism of the working classes realized that the Andhra people and the Tamil people need not quarrel with each other. We need not quarrel over one particular city or over other things. We will base our claims on justice on the basis of certain fundamental principles, on the basis of the language of the people and on the basis of contiguity of territories. It was on this basis that the working classes, the Communist Party and the other democratic movements shared their demands and they were able to mobilize the entire people on the basis of that ideology which is completely divorced from sloganistic ideologies, which makes one people not to fight against other people and which recognizes the right of every people in the world. It was because that ideology prevailed in this entire agitation that the Andhra struggle for a separate State was able to succeed. I know that that ideology is strong in Andhra and I know that it will grow from day to day despite all the manœuvres by the ruling cliques to keep themselves in power and despite all the dirty tricks that might be resorted to by them. I am sure the ideology of the working classes, the ideology of the democratic movement, will be able to mobilize more and more people, unite them together and will set an example to the people of the entire country. On that basis, it will unite not only the Andhra people but will play an important part in uniting the entire people of this country for fighting for real democracy and for smashing up all the reactionary forces in this country. Reactionary forces from vested interests and reactionary forces taking a communal garb—all these forces—will be smashed up by the ideology of the working classes and we will be able to build up a new and prosperous free India. I would, therefore, ask the members of this House to join me in rejoicing on this occasion and congratulate the Andhra people on this magnificent victory."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The House will now adjourn for lunch and reassemble at 3 p.m."

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

\* SRI V. RAMA RAO :—"అధ్యక్షా! ఈ ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర బిల్లు చర్చించే విషయంలో అనేక విషయాలు చెప్పబడినవి. వాటిలో అధిక విషయాలు సరిగా చర్చించబడలేదని అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాను. అస్త్రీ, అక్షుల పంపకాల సందర్భములలో సమాజంగా అన్నదమ్ములు పంచుకొనేటప్పుడు, ఉన్న అస్త్రీ, అక్షులు గూర్చి ఉభయాలకూ సమానంగా తెలిసిఉంటుంది. పంపకం చేసుకునే ముందు అస్త్రీ, అక్షులు ఏమిటి, ఇళ్లు వాకిళ్లు ఏమిటి వాటి రెక్క స్పష్టంగా తెలుసుకుని వాటి విలువ సరిగా తెలుసు

16th July 1953]

[Sri V. Rama Rao]

కొన్ని, తరువాత పంపకాలు ప్రారంభిస్తారు. పంపకాలు ప్రారంభించి ఒకంబడికలు జరిగే సందర్భంలో అన్నదమ్ములు వాటిలో భాగాలు కోరుకొన్నప్పుడుకాని, మరో సందర్భంలోగాని వాటి విలవలనుబట్టి ఒకరికి ఒకరు ఆస్తి హక్కు తగ్గులనుబట్టి ముదరా ఇవ్వడం సహజంగా జరిగే పద్ధతి. ఈ బిల్లు మాకు ఇచ్చినప్పుడు దానికి సంబంధించిన data షెడ్యూలు ఈ రకంగా principles తో పెట్టారు. డేన్న ఆఫీసర్లలో తమిళ ఆఫీసర్లు, ఆంధ్ర ఆఫీసర్లు, మళయాళ ఆఫీసర్లు, కన్నడ ఆఫీసర్లు ఎంతమందిఉన్నారో, ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రానికి ఎంతమంది కావలసివస్తుందో, ఈ సందర్భంలో ఇక్కడనుంచి ఎందరిని ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రానికి పంపవలసివస్తుందో ఈ విషయాలన్నిటినిగురించి స్పష్టంగా వివరాలు ఇచ్చిఉన్నట్లయితే కొంతవరకు ఉపయోగంగా ఉండేది. కొంతవరకు ఈ విషయాలలో సరియైన adjustments చేస్తే ఉభయాల మధ్యనుహ్యద్భావం ఉంటుంది. వారి కోర్కెలు వారి demands affect అవకుండా చూడాలి. ప్రయోజనాలను abstract గా పెట్టడంవల్ల వర్షించడానికి అవకాశం లేకుండా పోయింది. ఏ కొలత నిధితో విభజన జరగాలో స్పష్టంగా లేకపోవడంవల్ల ఒప్పుకునే అవకాశం లేకుండా పోతోంది. Clause by clause చర్చ జరిగే సందర్భంలో ఈ విషయాలు స్పష్టంగా తెలుసుకోవలసి ఉంటుంది. మనం విడిపోతున్నాం, మళ్ళీ మనం తగ్గవులు పెట్టుకో మాడదని చెబుతున్నాం. వాస్తవమే. కాని విషయాలు సాకల్యంగా తెలుసుకొనే అవకాశము లేనంతవరకు ఇదివరకుభక్త అనుమానాలనుబట్టి, ఒకరిమీద ఒకరికి అపోహలకు దారి తీసేవిధంగాఉంది. ఇప్పటికైనా ప్రభుత్వపక్షంవారు, ముఖ్యంగా ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు క్లాజువారి చర్చ జరిగే ముందు, వివరాలు స్పష్టంచేస్తే, క్లాజులమీద చర్చ జరిగేందుకు చాలా తోడ్పడుతుంది. చర్చ సుహృద్భావంతో సాగే అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. విడిపోయే సందర్భంలో చిన్నచిన్న adjustment ల విషయంలో అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. ఆ విషమయిన data supply చేస్తారని ఆశిస్తూ ఈ బిల్లును బలపరుస్తున్నాను. మరొక విషయం ఏమిటంటే ఈ ఆంధ్రా బిల్లు ఆంధ్ర ప్రజలకు ఒక అవకాశం కలిగి పోయింది. పురోభివృద్ధికి ఈ బిల్లులోనే నేను అర్థంచేసుకున్నంతవరకు ఆంధ్రులకు వారి అభివృద్ధికి అడ్డు కలిగించే విషయాలు చాలా ఉన్నవి. ఇన్ని అవాంతరాలున్నప్పటికీకూడా. ఏ ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకం అయితే అనేక అవాంతరాలు అభ్యంతరాలు అధిగమించి ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రము సాధించుకోగల్గారో ఆ ఆంధ్రులే అట్లాంటి అటుకాలనూ, అవాంతరాలనూ అధిగమించి త్వరలో ముగ్గుటి ఆంధ్రులతో విశాలాంధ్ర స్థాపించగలుగతారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. ఖనిజ సంపత్తితో, నదీజల వనరులతో, వివిధ సంపదలతో తులనాగే విశాలాంధ్ర స్థాపించి పురోభివృద్ధిగాంచి ముందుకు సాగిపోతారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. ఆంధ్రజాతి అభివృద్ధిని కోరుతూ ఉత్సవ్యసించిన మిత్రులందరికీ అభినందన చేస్తూ ముగిస్తున్నాను."

\* SRI K. V. S. PADMANABHA RAJU :—“అధ్యక్షా! ప్రస్తుతం మన ముందున్న ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర బిల్లుపై మాట్లాడుటకు నాకు అవకాశం ఇచ్చినందులకు సంతోషపడుచున్నాను. కాని ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకం వివిధమైన ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రం రకు కలలుకన్నారో ఈ రోజు అట్టి రాష్ట్రము ప్రసాదించబడడములేదు. బిల్లు క్లాజు వారిగా చూస్తే, ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకానికి చాలా అన్యాయము జరుగుతోందని సభ్యులందరికీ మనవిచేచున్నాను. చిరకాలమునుంచి ఆంధ్రులు, తమిళులు, మళయాళీలు, కన్నడిగులు సోదరభావముతో, కలిసి మెలిసి ఒకే గృహములో ఉన్న కుటుంబంలా ఉండి, ఈ విధంగా విడిపోతున్నప్పుడు, ఈ విధమైన బిల్లు తయారుచేసి ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకం ముందుపెట్టారంటే, చాలా విచారకరమైన విషయం. నేను ఒక్క విషయము మాత్రం చెప్పవలసియుంది. మదరాసు రాష్ట్రం, మదరాసు ఇంతవరకూ అభివృద్ధికి



[Sri K. V. S. Padmanbha Raju] [16th July 1953]

వచ్చిందంటే దానికి. కారకులు ఎవరయ్యా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఆంధ్రదేశంలో వసూలుచేసిన డబ్బువల్ల, ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకంయొక్క సహాయమువల్ల అని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకం మీకు ఏమి ద్రోహంచేసింది ఈవిధంగా బిల్లులో అన్యాయముచేయుటకు అని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఇదివరలో ఆంధ్రులెందరో ప్రధాన మంత్రిలుగా, ఆర్థిక మంత్రిలుగా, రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిలుగావుంటూ ఆంధ్ర, తమిళ భేదాన్నిప్రాయం లేకుండా జాతీయ దృక్పథంతో తమిళ ప్రదేశాన్ని అభివృద్ధిలోకి తీసుకొచ్చేరని వారు ఏమి చేశారని అడిగారు. కాని ఈ రోజున ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రం విడిపోతూ ఉన్నప్పుడు ప్రధాన మంత్రిగా యున్నవారు తమిళులు. ఆయనే నాయకత్వం వహించి ఇటువంటి విభజన చేశారంటే, వారికి ఆంధ్రులు ఏమి ద్రోహం చేశారు? ఆంధ్రులు, మళయాళీలు, తమిళులు, కన్నడిగులు ఒకే గృహంతో ఉమ్మడిగాఉంటూ ఆంధ్రులు విడిపోతూఉన్నప్పుడు ఆంధ్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని దివాలాతీయించే పరిస్థితులలోపెట్టి, ఆర్థిక చిక్కులలో పడచేసే రాష్ట్రం ఇవ్వడం అంటే చాలావిచారించవలసిన విషయం. ఈ రోజు ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రం ఎవరివల్ల వచ్చిందనే విషయం చాలా ముఖ్యమైనది. గత 40 సంవత్సరాలనుంచి ఆంగ్లేజున చేస్తూ కలలు కంటున్న ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రం ఎవరు తీసుకువచ్చారంటే అమరజీవియైన పొట్టి శ్రీరాములుగారని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రానికి కాకుండా, యావద్భారత దేశంలో భాషాప్రయుక్త రాష్ట్ర నిర్మాణానికి foundation stone వేసి ఆయన రక్తిం ధారపోసి వెల్లిపోయారని భారతీయ లండనా గుర్తింపవలసిన విషయము. ఇది ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రం కోరే ఆంధ్రులందరూ సంతోషపడవలసిన విషయమని సగర్వంగా మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. భాషా ప్రయుక్త రాష్ట్ర విభజన జరిగినప్పుడే దేశంలో పరిపాలనా విధానం సౌష్ఠవంగా జరగగలదు. భాషా ప్రయుక్త రాష్ట్ర విభజన జరగాలని ఆ రోజు జాతీయనాయకులు స్వాతంత్ర్య పోరాట సమయంలో ఉద్ఘాటించి ఆ నాయకులే అధికారంలోకివచ్చేసరికి ఆ కాంగ్రెసు నాయకులే భాషా ప్రయుక్త రాష్ట్రాలు కోరడం చాలా పొరపాటు, కోరకూడదని చెబుతున్నారు. ఇప్పుడు ఈ అసెంబ్లీలో ఆంధ్రా బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టినవారుకూడా అట్టి నాయకులలో ఒకరు ఆంధ్రులకు భాషా ప్రయుక్త రాష్ట్రానికి వ్యతిరేకులైన ఒకరు ఈ బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టారేమిటా అని మొట్టమొదట నాకు ఆనందం వచ్చింది. వారు ఇటువంటి బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టినప్పుడు, అది తయారుచేసినప్పుడూ ఆంధ్రులు మాకు రాష్ట్రము అక్కర్లేదని వెల్లిపోతారేమోనని, అవసరమైన పద్ధతినని భావిస్తున్నాను. రాష్ట్రంపడనలేము. ఎందుకంటే ఇంకా ఎన్నోళ్లు బాధపడతాం మేము మౌలిక వర్గాన్ని కోరేదేమిటంటే ఇన్ని రోజులవరకూ స్తోదరభావముతో ఉండి ఇప్పుడు విడిపోతున్నప్పుడు కూడా మమ్మల్ని స్తోదరభావంతో. సూతనంగా సాగిపోతున్న ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రం సౌష్ఠవమయిన రాష్ట్రంగా తయారుచేయాలి కాని, ఈ విధంగా అన్యాయమైన బిల్లు తయారుచేసి ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రం దివాలా తీసే పద్ధతిలో ఈ బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెడుతున్నారు. మళయాళీలు, కన్నడిగులు వారి భాషాప్రయుక్త రాష్ట్రాలు కోరేవారే కాబట్టి, మాకు ఉండే కష్టాలు వారికి వుంటాయి కాబట్టి, అట్టి సభ్యులందరూ క్లాజువారీ చర్చవచ్చినప్పుడు, సవరణలు తీసుకువచ్చి, స్తోదర భావముతో మాకు సహాయపడతారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టిన ప్రధాన మంత్రి రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు సమాన్యులుకారు. గవర్నరుగా, గవర్నరు-జనరలుగా పక్ష పాతములేని వ్యక్తిగాయుండి ఇట్టి బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టారంటే విచారించవలసిన విషయం యావద్భారత ప్రజానీకానికికూడా integrity కి honesty కి పేరుపడినవ్యక్తి ఆయనను తండ్రిగా భావిస్తున్నాను. అట్టివారు ఆర్థికంగా బడ్డెటులో; ఉద్యోగుల పంపిణీ విషయంలో తుంగభద్రా ప్రాజెక్టు విషయంలో న్యాయంచేస్తారని ఆశించాము. అది కూడా నమ్మకం లేకుండా ఉండి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయి తెన్నేటి విశ్వనాథంగారు,

3-10  
p.m.

16th July 1953] [Sri K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju]

పి. రామమూర్తిగారు ఈ విషయాలను గుర్తించి ముప్పటించారు. మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రం వలెనే మా రాష్ట్రం కూడా స్థిరపద్ధతులపై విర్వచేలా చూడడని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక గృహంలో తండ్రి, తల్లి, ముగ్గురు కొడుకులూ ఉంటే, ఒక ఆపాపాయి విడిపోయి కొత్త గృహంలో విడిగా కాపురం ఉండుటకు ప్రయత్నిస్తుంటే, కుటుంబములో వారు వాణ్ణి సంతోషంగా పంపాలి. కాని చిక్కులు పెట్టడం తగదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. దేశంలోనే కాకుండా ప్రపంచం అంతటిలో నాయకులుగా పరిగణించబడుతున్న నాయకుని చేతులతో ఇటువంటి బిల్లు తయారైందంటే, ఎట్లా ఆర్థం చేసుకోవాలో తెలియడం లేదు. వారు బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టే ముందు సోదరభావముతో విడిపోవాలనీ మనస్ఫుర్థులు మరచి పోవాలనీ మనవి చేశారు. వారియందు ఎవరికీ వ్యతిరేక భావంలేదు. దాని మీద మూడోరోజు discussion జరుగుతోంది. సవరణలు ప్రవేశపెట్టి మమ్మల్ని సోదరభావముతో పంపిన తరువాతనే, మేము సోదరభావం చూపించారని సంతోషించగలంగాని ఏదో ఇచ్చాం తీసుకోండయ్యా అంటే ఏం సంతోషిస్తాం! ఇంకా కొన్ని సంవత్సరాలు కలిసియున్నట్లయితే అసలే ఏమీ డబ్బులేదనే ఊర్జితి ఈ రెండు కోట్లు ముజరా ఎందుకు, ఒకకోటి చాలనే ఊర్జితి విర్వచుతుంది. ఆంధ్ర దేశంలో ఆంధ్రులు ఏ విధమైన బాధపడుతున్నారో, వారి ఆత్మలు ఏ విధంగా బాధపడుతున్నాయో అదేవిధంగా ఈ House లో యుండే సోదర సభ్యులు వారి యందు సుహృద్భావంతో మా రాష్ట్రానికి మమ్మల్ని పంపి, ఈ రాష్ట్రంలోవారు, మా రాష్ట్రములో మేము తప్పనిసరిగా స్నేహసంబంధాలు కలిగియుంటాము. ఈ విధంగా బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టడంలో నాకు ఆర్థం అయ్యే దృష్టిధం ఒక్కటే ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర సాధన కాకుండా కలతలు పెడుతూ ఉండడమే? మా రాష్ట్రంలో ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితులు మేము సరిదిద్దుకుంటాము. మిగిలిన విషయాలు క్లాజువారీ వర్చులో సోదరబలంతా మాట్లాడతారు సోదరభావంతో మా రాష్ట్రం విడదీసి సంతోషంగా పంపమని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.”

\* SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, while feeling happy over the formation of the Andhra State, I am also sorry for the way in which it is proposed to be formed as envisaged in the Bill. The Andhra State Bill is the outcome of a heroic movement followed by sacrifices of a supreme nature. These sacrifices were necessitated by the stubborn attitude adopted by selfish people who did not want the State at all on the one hand and people who wanted the State in all perfection on the other hand. I do not hesitate to hold both these sections of the people responsible for the loss to the Andhra State of one of its patriots, namely, Sri Potti Sriramulu, to whom every Andhra should pay homage to-day. I know that nothing comes out of bemoaning at this juncture. I ask the leaders at the helm of affairs in all seriousness whether this is the kind of State for which the Andhras fought all these years. I also ask in all earnestness whether the Government of India have not followed the policy of the British Government against which they complained formerly. Have not the Government of India imposed conditions which are detrimental to us? The movement for linguistic States is not at all a selfish movement. The Indian National Congress itself accepted the principle of linguistic States and formed the Pradesh Congress Committees on the basis of that principle. Then, why did they not form the Andhra State all these years? I am afraid I have to suspect the bona fides of the Government of India and the leaders at

3-20  
P.M.



[Sri M. Rajeswara Rao]

[16th July 1953]

the helm of affairs in this regard. We are compelled to give up our rights over the City of Madras in spite of the fact that the Tamil friends once gave up their rights over the City, in spite of the fact that the Dhar Commission suggested the constitution of the City into a Chief Commissioner's Province, in spite of the fact that Justice Wanchoo recommended that the City might be accepted as the temporary capital of the Andhra State and in spite of the fact that the Indian National Congress itself once accepted that the Andhras had a claim over the City by forming an Andhra District Congress Committee for Madras. Because all these reports seemed beneficial to Andhras, they were thrown into the waste paper basket. But what happened to the report of Justice Misra? Because that report seemed detrimental to the interests of Andhras, it was accepted immediately. From all these happenings I am at a loss to know how the Government of India will remove the suspicion of the Andhras about their bona fides in the formation of the Andhra State. Now we the Andhras are in darkness and gloom. I quite agree with the sentiment expressed by my hon. Friend, Mr. Krishnam Raju, that it would be more appropriate to call this State the Andhra State meaning thereby that it is a dark State than to call it the Andhra State. Who is to blame for all these happenings? It is not for me to answer this question. I hope the people of Andhra will reply to the question when the appropriate occasion arises.

“ Coming to the Bill, I submit that all the clauses are injurious to the interests of Andhras and Andhra State in all spheres of life. For example, there is no provision for the payment of adequate compensation for all the development schemes undertaken in the residuary State out of the finances of the composite State. It is provided in the Bill that the expenditure that may be incurred on the temporary capital before the appointed day should be borne by the Andhra State itself. I ask my hon. Friends here whether it is not just and proper to incur an expenditure of a few lakhs of rupees on the temporary capital out of the finances of the composite State, when we have allowed the construction of big buildings like this Legislative Assembly Chamber, the Legislators' Hostel and the Nurses' Quarters knowing full well that the Partition Committee met in 1950 and that the Andhra State would be formed sooner or later. After all, we are asking only for a few lakhs of rupees for constructing a temporary capital, and there is no provision in the Bill for the composite State to bear the expenditure.

“ With regard to Services, I may submit that at the time of the formation of the Orissa State, choice was given to the Orissa Government to determine the strength of the services required for that State, whereas in this Bill the power to determine the strength and to allot the personnel is given to the President of India. There is no provision for even consulting the Andhra State Government. I feel that this is a grave injustice done to the Andhra Government. With regard to the educational interests of Andhras,

16th July 1953] [Sri M. Rajeswara Rao]

sufficient safeguards are not provided. There are several provisions which are detrimental to the interests of Andhras. I hope the hon. Members of the House will consider all these aspects in a friendly manner.

“ Finally, I request the hon. Members from the residuary Madras State to forget what all had happened in the past in this regard and to co-operate with us in our endeavour to form not only the Andhra State but also the Visala Andhra for which we have been hoping all these years.”

\* THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Hon. Speaker, Sir, I consider it a privilege to be able to intervene in this debate for a few minutes in my personal capacity and also in my capacity as a Member of the Government. As the Hon. Chief Minister said in his introductory speech, the day on which the Andhra State will be inaugurated will be considered by the Andhras as a day of rejoicing all round. I say so from a particular point of view. On 15th August 1947 we gained our political independence as a nation. I am one of those who believe that the implications of political independence could be worked out by the realignment of the States in India on a linguistic basis, not because the various language groups cannot get on together, but because the only rational and natural way in which the units of the Indian Union could be reorganized for the future is on the basis of language. Wherever there was a sufficiently large number of people speaking one language in a contiguous area, that area could be formed into a separate State compatible with efficiency and financial solvency. This is the very basis on which the future constitution of our country was envisaged during the long period of freedom struggle. Therefore Andhras and others who wanted linguistic States felt and still feel that the implications of Indian independence could not be worked out fully unless the States were reorganized on the basis of language, the fundamental principle, as we all know, being that in any country in the world the administration has to be carried on in the language of the people. Education should be given through the medium of the language of the people, and such a natural thing should obtain in a free country which is a union of many language units, big language units, big enough to form units of a sub-continent, if we may call it, of our country. In that sense, the Andhras will certainly feel that the formation of the Andhra State is only the logical fulfilment, if I may say so, of the implementation of political independence that has accrued to the country. They feel that this is the only way in which the proper destiny of language groups, particularly, south of the Vindhyas, can be worked out and that the formation of the Andhra State is only the beginning of the formation of other linguistic States, including the State of Tamil Nad. From that point of view, I am sure that every hon. Member in this House, be he one who speaks Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam or Kannada, in his heart of hearts would welcome the formation of linguistic States. (Interruption.) I doubt that, Sir, if I may frankly express my opinion. I consider that before long the Government of India will take up this

3 30  
p.m.



[Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao]

[16th July 1953]

question as they have already promised, and that is the only way in which the boundaries of States could be fixed in South India on the basis of large language units. That does not at all imply that there ought to be or that there is any inherent disharmony or lack of fellow-feeling between these various peoples. We are all citizens of India and are proud to belong to our country. We all owe fealty to our country from first to last and when we speak of a linguistic State, we think of the proper way of implementing that political freedom and that citizenship in the interests of the people. This particularly becomes very relevant when every man in the country has a vote in the administration as well as the Legislature and we know from our experience in the Legislature, from the considerable inconvenience caused to many Members, that it is not possible for an indefinite period to carry on our administration or the proceedings in the Legislature in a language which does not belong to any one who lives in this country. Therefore, Sir, the day on which we are considering the Andhra State Bill which clearly places before us the date on which the Andhra State will be formed is a day of rejoicing for the Andhras, not only the Andhras but also those people who believe and think that the linguistic realignment of States is the right way of reorganizing our units in the Indian Union.

“ In connection with the formation of the Andhra State, hon. Members have referred to the history of the movement. I shall not take up the time of the House in referring to the history of the movement in detail. But I should say one thing that those who were responsible for presenting the ideology of the Andhra movement and the demand for the formation of the Andhra State, were people who were very definite in their minds that the linguistic State was required so that they could carry on a democratic Government through the language and that it was intended to promote culture through the language and also to create a sense of cohesion and unity in working out the constructive programmes in the particular area. The demand was not made in any spirit of differences or incompatibility with the neighbours, which should be called injustice to the progenitors of this movement. I cannot but remember to-day two names. The name of Sri Desabhakta Konda Venkatapayya will be remembered by every Andhra when the Andhra State Bill is under consideration. The other name that will be remembered is that of Sri Potti Sriramulu who sacrificed himself in the genuine belief that through his sacrifice he was impressing upon the Government of India the need to create the Andhra State at the earliest opportunity as provided in the Constitution. There are other honoured names, but I shall not take up the time of the House in adding to the list. The ideology of the movement was based not on a spirit of disharmony, but it was started for the purposes that I have stated, so that they thought that the Andhra State would be among other linguistic States occupying a place in the Indian Union. To-day we are considering the proposition that the Andhra State Bill be taken up by the Parliament. We welcome this decision of the Government of India.

16th July 1953] [Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao]

Whatever may be the difficult problems that we have to face and solve and whatever may be the doubts and difficulties that we have, we welcome this measure. I am sure every Andhra, particularly, in this House will take up this task in a spirit of determination to see that we complete our business in a business-like manner and try to finish the discussions in time so that the Bill may be considered by the Parliament.

“ Then, there are various questions that have been referred to. I do not wish to anticipate the discussions that may take place later when amendments to various clauses will be taken up. But, there is the overwhelming question of boundaries, the final boundaries of the State, which agitates people on all sides, the Kannadas, the Tamils and the Andhras, and particularly the Andhras in Bellary. I wish the whole thing were left to a Boundary Commission without any interim decisions and recommendations. But that has not been so. A report has been made by Mr. Justice Misra about Bellary, particularly, the three firkas under reference, and the Government of India have accepted it. I hope that in the light of public opinion, they will be able to reconsider their decision. But, that does not mean that we should encourage or carry on an unending strife which will lead to considerable difficulties. It is enough if we hope that the Government of India will be able to deal with the entire question of boundaries for which we ask for a Boundary Commission in an appropriate manner to take public opinion on all sides. The Boundary Commission must be properly constituted and only after this Commission has heard the views on all sides, any final decision must be arrived at. One thing is important. This question of boundaries should not be made a ground for acrimonious discussion or direct action movement which will lead to further complications and create a very unfavourable atmosphere for the progress which we have to make in regard to the formation of the Andhra State and the settlement of a number of important issues.

3-40  
p.m.

“ Then there is the big question of the settlement on the division of assets and liabilities between the Andhra, Mysore and the Residuary Madras States. On a question like this wide divergence of opinion is inevitable among the members belonging to various parts, but a solution has to be found somehow or other. The recommendation of the Government of India seems to be based largely on Mr. Wanchoo's recommendations. After all it must be remembered that we have no liquid assets about which we can quarrel to-day. We have only a considerable amount of liability about the allocation of which we are so much worried and agitated. Many Andhras feel that they should receive a more favourable allotment of the liabilities. They feel that many of the institutions common to the whole State—almost all of them—are outside the Andhra State barring very few, and for these they have to spend money and start from scratch. Unfortunately, some of the regional institutions also happen to be in Bellary. I am quite sure that arrangements will be made as per the Schedule to the Act and by negotiations later with regard to facilities in these



[Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao] [16th July 1953]

common institutions. Such assistance will be necessary and must be provided for as long a time as essential. The Andhras feel that they deserve a more favourable allocation in regard to debts. Because they feel that the income on the Irrigation Projects should have been taken into consideration. But the people of the Residuary State feel naturally that they also cannot bear disproportionately a heavy part of the Public Debt. In a matter like this, there ought to be a give and take policy and if possible an agreement at this stage. If anything is left out, it could be considered and decided at a later stage by the two States. In any case, there should not be any acrimony displayed in this regard. Because, ultimately we expect that the Government of India will have the last say in the matter. We can hope that the Government of India will take all these things into consideration when they consider how best to help the new State to enable it to stand on its own feet. In other words, they have naturally to consider these things when they take up the question of giving grants and subventions to the new State.

“ Finally, the Government of India in the draft Bill that they have sent to us seem to desire that adjustment should be made between the two States with regard to the allocation of personnel. I think the attitude of the Government of India should be welcome, as they have left this matter to be settled by the two States in consultation.

“ Before concluding, I wish to appeal to the hon. Members of this House in all quarters and in particular to my Andhra brethren as well as to my brethren from Tamil Nad to approach this problem in a spirit of give and take and not in any other spirit. I am quite sure that such spirit will prevail within a measurable time and within one week we will be able to finish the consideration of the clauses so that we can send the Bill back to Delhi in time. With these few words, I thank you, Sir, very much for this opportunity that you have given me to participate in this debate.”

\* SRI K. M. SEETHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Muslim League party I have great pleasure in supporting this motion requesting the Government of India to introduce the Bill for the formation of the Andhra State in the Parliament. The fulfilment of the aspirations of millions of people inhabiting a contiguous territory on grounds of homogeneity of religion, culture, language, traditions and the feeling of belonging to one another should certainly be deemed to be in furtherance of the national aspirations of the people of this country. The principle of formation of linguistic States cannot be criticised or commented upon adversely at this late hour when the Nation is practically committed to the formation of such States consistent with the stability and unity of the whole country. As far as the prospective Andhra State is concerned, on behalf of the Muslim League, I feel it my duty to make a request. Whatever Government might come into existence in Andhra to guide the destinies of the people of that

16th July 1953]

[Sri K. M. Seethi]

State, the interests of the minorities especially the Muslim minority in that State will be a sacred trust in their hands, situated as they are at present. Muslims in Andhra will be practically voiceless in the governance of the State inasmuch as there is not going to be even a single Muslim Member in the Legislative Assembly for the Andhra State, thanks to the highly defective and unsatisfactory electoral system which is now in vogue to elect legislators guiding the destinies of millions of the people of this sub-continent. It is my earnest desire and request to the Central Government that early steps may be taken to modify the unsatisfactory system of election which is now prevailing and which successfully deprives the minorities of their proper and effective representations in the Legislatures of the country. Unless and until some system like the system of proportional representation with single transferable vote is introduced or reservation for minorities through special electorates or otherwise is made, the minorities in the country cannot expect to have their voice effectively heard by the administration in the country. It is my earnest request to the Government that is coming into power in Andhra that the various needs and disabilities of the Muslim minority may be sympathetically and generously considered by them. The absence of Muslim representatives in the Legislature should not be allowed to be a reason for denying them justice to which they are legitimately entitled. With these few words, I heartily support this motion relating to the formation of the Andhra State on behalf of the Muslim League Legislature Party."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. With great interest and anxiety, I have been following the general discussion on this Bill by so many hon. Members of this House. Mr. Ramamurthi, the Leader of the Opposition, made a thundering speech. I was hearing with rapt attention every word of his speech. Sir, Mr. Rajagopalachariar, the Chief Minister, has introduced this Bill here. What is this measure? Is this an Andhra Bill or is it a Mysore Bill or is it some other Bill, all conjointly introduced here for purposes of being introduced later in the Parliament? I cannot blame the Chief Minister, Mr. Rajagopalachariar, entirely as having been responsible for this measure. In my view, this is not an Andhra Bill. An Andhra Bill must be confined to Andhra interests. It is not confined to Andhra interests. It is alien to Andhra interests and contains provisions which we have not had opportunity to discuss with the other States concerned. I am hoping, Sir, not to say any harsh word about anybody while speaking on this Bill. But we are in a very delicate and difficult position to-day, difficult because, we are told that Madras City cannot be even the temporary capital of Andhra as was recommended by Mr. Justice Wanchoo. Now we have to commit ourselves to this Bill according to the directions of the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and we have so many troubles in the matter. Sir, this Bill could not have been called an Andhra Bill.

3-50  
P.m.



[Sri T. Prakasam]

[16th July 1953]

“ Then, Sir, coming to the question of unity of the Andhras, we have to be thankful for the unity achieved by all the twelve districts of Andhra on one matter, however much they might differ on other matters. In fact, if six of the twelve districts of Andhra territory should say ‘ we do not want this Bill because we have no interest in it and our interests have not been protected ’, this Bill cannot be passed. So far as we, Andhras are concerned, the first question was whether we were united on the question of capital. We had grave apprehensions that we might not come to any common agreement. But somehow or other, we were able to get over the first hurdle, if not by a unanimous decision at least by a majority decision of the Members. That hurdle having been got over, we are now faced with the second hurdle, that is, this Bill. The Bill has been introduced but for whose benefit I am asking. Is it for the Andhras’ benefit or is it for the benefit of others? Who asked for the inclusion of the Mysore State in this Bill? Who asked for the introduction of conditions with regard to the Mysore State? Now my friend, Mr. Rajagopalachariar, who introduced in this Bill read out only the first sentence in the first clause. What is that? That is, this Bill is for Andhras. He did not refer to what is written at the top of the Bill, those three or four lines. It says ‘ for the benefit of Andhras, for increasing the Mysore State area and for decreasing the territory of the Madras State and matters connected therewith.’ I am inclined to tell my friend that he is innocent. He does not know anything about our conditions. If he were a party to this arrangement, he will be guilty of a very serious offence. I say so purposely because this is a Bill intended for the Andhras. Where is Mysore here? What is the claim put up by the Mysore State and how was the claim adjudicated upon?

4-p.m.

“ Sir, is this the way in which a Bill of this nature, of this magnitude should be conceived and should be introduced here? We may be ignorant people, we may be innocent people, we may have been in a helpless position and continue to be so even to-day. We have been in the helpless position not only now, for five years we have been in that position. We came into the Assembly in the hope of serving the people. Where are the people? They were left behind. Those supposed to be leading the country, those supposed to be governing the country, they left them behind. And we have been engaged for five long years in fighting for the benefit of the nation for the people at large. We have been fighting to get rid of the old administration, to get rid of the Ministers against whom people had complained and on whose behalf we formulated complaints. We could not get relief anywhere. We had been compelled to go to the country during the General Elections. It was the voters at the General Elections that dismissed those Ministers against whom there were charges. Therefore it is that I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sri Ramamurthi, completely that it is the people that should count in the end if not to-day. To-day it may not be possible for the people to say that they count anywhere. They have been left

16th July 1953]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

alone and we are here considering whether this Bill is beneficial to the people in the Andhra area. Nobody could think how anybody could conceive it and say something of one district should go into Mysore State, or into the Andhra State or remain in the Residuary State of Madras. Nobody can account for this. When I was in some distant place, I heard that some Deputy Minister of the Government of India made a statement on the floor of the Parliament 'We will decide to-morrow finally about Bellary'. That to-morrow came in the form of Chief Justice of Hyderabad, Mr. Misra coming down here to record his verdict. It is called an award. It is not an award. As a matter of fact it was an opinion recorded by Mr. Justice Misra on behalf of the Government of India, if you can call it so. Beyond that it cannot be called an award as had been already pointed out by some hon. Friends on the floor of this House. Mr. Justice Misra said what? I have been one of the living persons who happened to go to him and put in a memorandum also and state exactly the position of Bellary. Many things were talked about. I have no inclination to contradict them or do any such thing. The only plea which we can record at present is to request Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari, the Chief Minister, here to treat Bellary on an equal footing with all the other places for which they have proposed to give an amendment for the setting up of a Boundary Commission. I do not know what the amendment of the Government proposes to do with regard to this Boundary Commission. There can be only one Boundary Commission for the whole of disputed areas. Well, Sir, as I have pointed out to you at the outset this is not a Bill for the benefit of the Andhras because what is it that the Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said on the floor of the Parliament some time ago? He said all the Telugu-speaking areas must be brought into one State. All the Telugu-speaking areas, he stated, must be brought into one State excluding Madras. Leave aside Madras now for the time being. Some fellows have been saying we have lost Madras. We have not lost Madras. (Laughter.) We can never lose Madras. We do not admit that we are parting company with our Tamil friends also. How can we part company with Tamil friends? It is not a matter of one day. To-day there are admittedly 35 to 40 lakhs of Andhras in the Tamil area. So long as these people are there and so long as we are continued to be called Andhras, we cannot be separated. And therefore they, the Tamils cannot also be separated. They say they are separated. We are separating to-day for the purpose of administration, to avoid exploitation which has been going on at the cost and sacrifice of those unfortunate Andhras for a very long time. Beyond that there can be no separation so far as we are concerned. We are bound to continue like this especially when there are hon. Members who are giving their daughters in marriage to the people of Coimbatore and other places. The relationship continues. Therefore never mind whether you are Tamil or Andhra. The relationships are there and they are continuing. So it is wrong to say that we are separating. Therefore you should not sympathise with us. We have not lost anything. There is



[Sri T. Prakasam]

[16th July 1953]

nothing for you to sympathise with us. But there is one thing. In this exploitation how have the Andhra people been treated? What is their position with regard to assets and liabilities? What is their position with regard to distribution of the Services and all other matters? All these have to come in now. These are the points that we have to consider well and decide upon dispassionately.

"As I said, all the Telugu-speaking areas must be brought into the Andhra State. I pointed this out even while Mr. Wanchoo was going into the matter. I gave him schedules of the areas which we are claiming as parts of the Andhra State. All these things were received by him well. He was an accommodating gentleman to all of us. He gave answers to all of us, but finally he said: 'Well, Mr. Prakasam, how do you expect me to go into all these questions relating to matters which should be decided only by a Boundary Commission?' I had to agree straightway that it would not be possible for him to go into the question of the Boundary Commission at that enquiry itself and waited for the introduction of the principle in the Bill. Simultaneously we were also anxious to get it decided. We had had bitter experiences over this matter in the past. Therefore I was anxious personally not to do anything which would delay or interrupt the formation of the Andhra State as conceived by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

4-10  
p.m.

"We demanded that the Andhra State should not be formed by merely including all these twelve districts over which there was no dispute according to them at that time. The scope of reference of Pandit Nehru was that all the Telugu-speaking areas should be included and I want those areas. Mr. Vinayakam was very eloquent over Tiruttani and Chittoor. Let us go together—and we will go—to other areas also which are supposed to be in dispute: Not only Chittoor, but North Arcot, Salem, Hosur and Mr. Rajaji also. (Laughter.) In Hosur, there are three high schools and those are Telugu schools. There are elementary schools also. Most of them, almost all of them are Telugu schools and the people are Telugus. Rajaji is also a Telugu man. (Laughter.) So, Hosur, Krishnagiri, etc., are Telugu areas. So far as North Arcot, Gudiyattam, Wandiwash and other places are concerned, all of them are Telugu. No doubt, it is the misfortune of the Andhras to say that 'this is our area'. 'Only this area must be defined to be an Andhra area.' It is not so. I will be able to show before any Boundary Commission that comes, taking the maps, how they were all Telugu and how they were changed later according to conditions and circumstances. Therefore, we should not say—Mr. Vinayakam should not think and be eloquent in saying that he will prove this and that—so much only is Andhra area. Let us wait for that time and show to what extent the Telugu-speaking people are spread over the country.

"Now, Sir, . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"You take me or Hosur?"

16th July 1953]

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Hosur and you also. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, in Tiruvallur taluk in Chingleput district, people had some hopes when Sri Jawaharlal Nehru announced that the Andhra State would be formed and they thought that the Telugu-speaking people could all be brought into one area. They held conferences. Unfortunately for them, they invited me and I also attended. It was to their misfortune, I should say, that I attended. Because I was an advocate of their position and I supported them. Do you know what happened? At Uttukottai(?) there is a high school. There a Telugu-speaking man was the headmaster. He was suspended or removed or perhaps dismissed; I do not know what happened to him afterwards. Much repression was carried on on that account with a view to frighten the people living there who were anxious to come into the newly-formed Andhra State. Such things happened and I referred to these repressions in my memorandum to Mr. Wanchoo also. (Interruption.) Take North Arcot. Mr. Vinayakam says that six taluks of this district have been taken away. (Interruption.) Yes, Mr. Narasimham, his (Chief Minister's) son filed a memorandum before Mr. Justice Wanchoo also. (Laughter.) I wanted to know whether the Boundary Commission which you are pleading for will go into the question of Bellary also.

“ Sir, about Bellary, I would like to say a few words. Bellary is a place known to me for a very long time. The earliest of the elections to the Council of Madras took place long ago, nearly 36 years ago. In those days all the twelve districts constituted one constituency and there was one seat. One gentleman, Kolachalam Venkata Rao was the candidate in Bellary and he was a friend of mine. I was a young man at that time. There was a friend of mine who stood as a candidate from Kakinada. Peculiarly situated as I was, I was supporting Kolachalam Venkata Rao. I had to go around the twelve districts, including Bellary. I went to Bellary. Did I find any of these gentlemen who were claiming Bellary? I was practising as a lawyer in Madras and I was appearing in the courts in Bellary also. That experience enabled me to understand the position of Bellary. There is no question of denying facts—facts are being denied in these days. Almost when I say it is black, my friend gets up in opposition and says it is white. (Interruption.) Sir, let us take the revenue accounts of Bellary district for the last 100 years which will show in what language the administration of that district was carried on.”

4-20  
p.m.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ One hundred years' injustice has been done.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Sir, this is what the Hon. Dr. Nagan Gouda says, a colleague of the Hon. Chief Minister. That is the kind of colleague he has in his Cabinet. (Interruption.) Englishmen were good when they came here. But we charged them and made them bad people. After we sent them away, we took their place and have proved worse and that is the whole situation. The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari should not be angry with me. I am not referring to-day to the anecdotes in this struggle during the last 30 years or so. We are confining ourselves to



[Sri T. Prakasam]

[16th July 1953]

matters connected with the formation of the Andhra State. I submitted to Mr. Wanchoo that a Boundary Commission should decide the boundaries and only then it would be possible to bring all the Telugu-speaking areas together according to the statement of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We reconciled ourselves to the present position as otherwise this Bill would not be passed immediately.

“ Then, Sir, what was the financial position of the joint State before the partition and what is the financial position now? Without taking any of our friends or the Leader into details, I can say that over Rs. 62.0 crores have been spent by this Government during the last few years. Can it be imagined? All the moneys have been spent. Mr. Wanchoo also asked me, ‘ Well, Mr. Prakasam, you now claim so many crores, but they have no money ’. I told him, Sir ‘ Whether they can give us money or not, is this the way in which we should be treated? The creditor must be duly respected by the debtor. Look at the way in which the Tamilians are contending that we should have no place in Madras even for a temporary period.’ Mr. Wanchoo said, ‘ Then they had money, now there is no money. What do you propose?’ I did not make any further proposal. I must say on this occasion in this Assembly that it has become a fancy for the Prime Minister to appoint Chief Justices for these works. The work of a Chief Justice is different. Chief Justice Misra was here for a short time and finished his work. Chief Justice Wanchoo stayed here at leisure and examined the whole problem and he tried to do some justice. But, even his recommendation that the temporary capital should be in Madras for a period of two or three years was not accepted. I do not know what happened there (Delhi). Anything may be said and done. It so happened that the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has got to his credit the highest honour of prevailing upon Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that in Madras there would be no peace at all if Andhras were allowed to have their temporary capital in Madras City. If that is so, it is not fair. If that is not so, I must withdraw. There can be no question of my withdrawing, because such an extreme step could not have been taken by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru but for the Hon. Chief Minister’s influence. According to the reports, the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari was stated to have said, ‘ I will resign if you allow Andhras to remain in Madras.’ What offence did we commit to you or to any of our Tamil friends? We suffered for at least five years at the hands of all those who were in charge of the Government. We did suffer and we did not do any violent act ourselves and to say that Andhra people would not allow peace to be maintained in Madras is not fair and proper. It was the least justifiable act on the part of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to have done so, and I am not a man to go and try to persuade again Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru promising him this and that. No such thing would be done. We obeyed. My conception of a capital for the Andhra State was that some day or other the Andhra State must have a capital of its own apart from Madras. Madras, of course,

16th July 1953]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

I claim to be a joint City,—a joint City according to the Dhar Committee recommendations. Their finding was 'Whoever might have been the originators of Madras City, subsequently Tamils and Andhras lived together and developed the City and so we must hold that this is a joint City and it must be a Chief Commissioner's State'. That was how the Dhar Commission recommended. However, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister could not be expected to remember all the details that were going on from year to year and he forgot all about this. With regard to Madras, when he came here I made a representation to him in an interview which I had with him and until now he has not declared that Madras City is a Tamil City. It is a Residuary Madras State. That is the position in which we are. It is a Residuary Madras State consisting of Tamils, Andhras, Gujarathis, Malayalees and others. All these people constitute the Residuary Madras State, and that is not to be taken into account in the formation of the Andhra State. So we have conveniently left it off for the time being. Mr. Speaker, Sir, one of the newspapers in this City had the goodness or rather the audacity to say that Bellary provoked the Tiruttani incidents and I do not know how it was possible for this newspaper man to connect the two. I submit, Sir, that the Bellary position is not appreciated by anyone in the Centre. During the absence of Sri Jawaharlal Nehru, Moulana Abul Kalam Azad, who was asked to act for him, pounced upon the Bellary people and said that the question had been decided finally and once for all and that nobody could re-open that question now and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru just repeated the statement after he came back. I wish to submit that he and the other Ministers of the Centre should remember that although one is the Prime Minister and the others are Ministers, they are all servants of the people and it is the people of the country that have placed them in positions of responsibility and power. It is in fact written in the Constitution itself that it is the people who are the real rulers of the country and not the Prime Minister or the other Ministers. I conceived that idea even fifteen years ago when I was his lieutenant. Whenever I met the people, I told them: 'I am your servant and I have come to serve you all' and I submit to the House and to the Government that it is in that way that we should understand the position. I feel that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru should not be treating this question of Bellary in the manner he has done. Professor Ranga went to New Delhi all the way and he took another friend, Sri Ganappa, with him in the hope that he would be able to convince him and there he tried to negotiate with him. If I have understood him, I can say how we should approach him and that is if we approach him at all we should approach him through Sri C. Rajagopalachariar."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sri Prakasam will kindly withdraw the last remark. It is wrong and a wrong interpretation is possible and, therefore, please do not do that."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" If it pleases my friend, I shall withdraw."



[Sri T. Prakasam]

[16th July 1953]

"As Chief Minister, you have to hold the scales even and, therefore, it is that everyone of the Members of the House who was speaking on the motion addressed his remarks to the Chief Minister appealing to him and I have also submitted and surrendered myself to everything that is going on and I am also making the same appeal along with them to you." (Cheers.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"That is your old habit."

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"If I go wrong I withdraw at once unconditionally and unhesitatingly, but if I am not in the wrong, I would press it and I am now so happy to press my viewpoints through you so far as Bellary is concerned. Regarding this, Mr. Speaker, Sir, one English civilian who was serving in Bellary, after reading about the controversy, wrote in the *Mail* and wrote to me also to fight out the Bellary question. He is the person who, I recognize, was Mr. Jenkins who was a District Judge in that place. He said that that town of Bellary is a Telugu town. This is not a matter which can be lightly brushed aside. After all, Sir, I wish to ask: 'What is the offence that they have committed?' They have committed offences which you have committed and I committed, offences which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru committed and which Abul Kalam Azad committed, by observing Satyagraha and doing all kinds of things. Even in those days, Sir, Sri Rajagopalachari was a shrewd man. Those were the days when the *Swarajya* paper was started and during those days we met in the top storey of No. 40, Broadway and Messrs. Suryanarayana, Rajagopalachari and E. V. Ramaswami Naicker were talking about disobeying orders under section 144 and, at that time, Pappu Sitaramaiah was the Magistrate and there was a competition between Sri Ramaswami Naicker and Sri Rajagopalachari as to who should go first. Sri Naicker said that he would go and Sri C. Rajagopalachari said that he should go first and did start first. Whatever, therefore, may be the position at present of the Prime Minister of India and of the Deputy Prime Minister of the Union, they should not forget their past, namely, that they plighted themselves as the servants of the people and it is as the servants of the people that they have got into office. I suggest to the Chief Minister that he uses his good offices in connexion with the Bellary question and I wish there should be no controversy over this question on the part of our Kannadiga friends. So many things have happened in the past and we have been adjusting ourselves to the questions that arose from time to time. We can do similarly with reference to this question also. About the question of Chittoor, I shall make a promise to Sri Vinayakam that I shall be present when the Boundary Commission comes and takes evidence. I do not wish to enter into details as to how I understand the whole thing and how I felt that the whole map should be re-written in those areas. I had been to so many areas in the Chingleput and North Arcot districts, to Wandiwash, Arkonam and other places and there were all Telugu-speaking people there. What is to happen to them

16th July 1953] [Sri T. Prakasam]

under the scheme of the boundary question? I shall reserve my observations on that point till we come up to the amendments pertaining to that question.

“ With regard to assets and liabilities which form matters for the Schedule to the Bill, I have all regard for those who imagined that this could be drafted like this and presented to Parliament in the form in which it has appeared. I wonder how it could be done with regard to the question of assets and liabilities.

“ A hot controversy had been going on over these matters but I did not wish to interrupt because I thought that when we are going out of this State and forming a new State, as it were, we need not be disturbed much on account of this. It is only for the new State when it is formed to take the responsibility. 4-40 P.M.

“ My Friends have already referred to some of the clauses of this Bill which was drafted here, introduced here and then to be passed on to the President of the Indian Republic for orders or approval. This is hardly fair to the new State for whose benefit this Bill was drafted. This is not the way in which any Bill should be introduced or piloted even in Parliament. Of course, we are only at the commencement of this business. After this general discussion various amendments will be coming and in considering them a just and proper view should be taken by those who were opposed to the Andhra interests up till now.

“ Well, Sir, I was anxious about the burden that was thrown upon us regarding the selection of the Capital and I have told you what had happened. How are we going to proceed with the other items that remain to be carried out? My friends, who are not in agreement with us and who are always suspecting that we would be unjust—even representatives in this Assembly—have been saying in season and out of season and also to my very face when I was presiding over them that we have divided the whole thing amongst ourselves. We form one wing of the whole of this Assembly. We belong to what is called the Praja-Socialist Party. The Praja-Socialist Party was anxious that they should not stand out and should do their best to help in the formation of the new State. Let there be no misunderstanding either outside or inside in our country, in regard to the attitude of some of us, when we were opposing this measure. Sir, this is not the measure which the late Sri Potti Sriramulu wanted to have. In unmistakable terms Sri Potti Sriramulu stated that so far as Madras City is concerned it must be considered as a joint City and must be made into a Chief Commissioner's Province. Because the Andhra leaders were quarrelling among themselves over this matter without coming to any decision that unfortunate man—I should call him a fortunate man who could lay down his life for the freedom of the country—died. He came here to Madras and owned a house in Madras City. He formulated his demand and insisted on it. When Sri Jawaharlal Nehru heard that he died, he also felt very sorry and he then said that the Andhra State must be carved out. This is how Sri Jawaharlal Nehru came to this conclusion. So far as Sri Potti Sriramulu



[Sri T. Prakasam]

[16th July 1953]

was concerned, he was a man of the Madras City and he formulated the demand that the Andhra State should be formed including the Madras City. I do not wish to raise any objection even on this score because it is a matter that has got to be settled later on. Let us first look to this business of the formation of the new State. It would tax the energies of not one man but of many persons and would tax even the energy of Mahatma Gandhi should he be here now. Whatever place be the Capital, though we have put it on the banks of the Tungabhadra instead of on the banks of the Pennar or the Krishna or the Godavari, it must be taken as accepted.

“The next question is ‘How are we to get on with regard to the remaining items?’ I have said this publicly in other places and I am also saying it here that so far as we of the Praja-Socialist Party are concerned, when the Congress Party leader, Sri Sanjeeva Reddi approached us—or we met together—in regard to the formation of the new State, we said that there must be a basis of agreement between us both. I was a Congressman at one time and I came out of that Party. The Socialists approached us and the so-called merger, the Praja-Socialist Party, was effected. Soon after the merger troubles started in our own party here. So far as the Praja-Socialists were concerned, they proposed that they would work together with the Congress on the basis of a minimum programme and if the Congress accepted it there could be a coalition between the Praja-Socialists and the Congress. This was made known to Sri Sanjeeva Reddi. He took his own time, consulted his friends and then wrote to us saying that this proposal was acceptable. We also agreed to work with them on this basis. I can assure all those friends who are imagining that we have divided the Chief Minister's office and other offices and jobs amongst ourselves that nothing of that sort has happened and what I have now stated is our relative position with regard to the Congress. We had not entered into any commitments regarding the formation of the Government. Such a stage was not reached and even if such a stage had been reached all of you would have known what had happened.

4-50  
p.m.

“I have been a student of the British Constitution all my life. I have studied so many constitutions. My opinion is that the British Constitution is the best in the world. My idea is that we should proceed on that basis. With regard to the proposed coalition of the Praja-Socialist Party and the Congress Party, I wish to say that nothing has been done by any of us. My conception of the Andhra State is that it should be modelled on the British Constitution. What is the British model? Our Constitution has been framed on the model of the British Constitution. The old Government of India Act framed by the British Government has been copied wholesale in our Constitution. According to the British standards, we should have unity amongst ourselves. In the past we had committed wrongs against one another. Now we should forget all those things and we should come together and make every effort to form one unit as it were. We have succeeded in bringing together various

16th July 1953]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

parties. The Congress Party was cut off from us. The K.L. Party members have become associate members of the Congress Party. We, the Praja-Socialist Party members gave a minimum programme as the basis for a coalition with the Congress Party and the latter had accepted them. To that extent we were very glad. We should all work together, think together and act together for the same purpose in the future. What we have undertaken is a very serious responsibility. It is a very great responsibility to form a Government. It is not easy. It is not enough if one should say, 'I will give so many places in the Cabinet to this Party, so many places to the other group and so on'. That is not the British method or model of governing the country. The British method is a very sacred method. All must unite and elect a leader and that leader must be in a position to form the Government. That is not an easy job for any of us. We must strain every nerve during the next few days and weeks to forge a united front. No step prejudicial to the formation of our State should be taken by us. That is how I am feeling in the matter and that is why I am seeking the help of you. All of you must help us. Now as we are going away, many of you may wish God-speed to us and wishwell of us. What are we going to do in the new State? Are we going to drown ourselves in the Krishna or the Godavari or the Tungabhadra rivers? (Laughter.) We have got to develop our State, develop our industries, etc. The Capital question has been rightly or wrongly settled. Supposing we had not settled that question, the whole formation of the Andhra State would have come to an impasse. I have no doubt about that. I have had experience of the Rayalaseema friends in the past who went to Delhi and gave in writing that they did not want a State.

“ Mr. Ramamurthi was complimenting the Andhras on achieving their cherished desire. I was glad that he mentioned it. I also wish to compliment our people on the way in which they struggled hard and survived the onslaughts—not from one side but from so many sides. I am also glad that they are prepared to take any steps that we are prepared to indicate in a proper and reasonable manner. Sir, the formation of the State is not a mere matter of jobs. It is a matter of grave responsibility. How can we get on with this Bill with all its schedules, etc.? If Mr. Rajagopalachari had undertaken as an arbitrator to decide things to save us from all this wretchedness and said, 'I will give you so many crores of rupees . . .', we would have been satisfied, absolutely satisfied. Instead of doing that, we are asked to work out arithmetic, geometry and all sorts of things and finally arrive at zero. I thank you, Sir.”

## II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION—cont.

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ Sir, on a point of order, I wish to know what has happened to the adjournment motion? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have discussed it with the Leader of the Opposition and the motion will be taken up on Monday.”